

2002 and 2003 for the United States Customs Service for antiterrorism, drug interdiction, and other operations, for the Office of the United States Trade Representative, for the United States International Trade Commission, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 426, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 327, noes 101, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

AYES—327

Ackerman	Callahan	Edwards
Aderholt	Calvert	Ehlers
Akin	Camp	Ehrlich
Allen	Cannon	English
Andrews	Cantor	Eshoo
Armey	Capito	Etheridge
Bachus	Capps	Everett
Baird	Cardin	Ferguson
Baker	Carson (OK)	Fletcher
Baldacci	Castle	Foley
Ballenger	Chabot	Forbes
Barcia	Chambliss	Fossella
Barr	Clement	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Coble	Gingrich
Barton	Collins	Galleghy
Bass	Combest	Ganske
Bentsen	Cooksey	Gekas
Bereuter	Costello	Gibbons
Berkley	Cox	Gilchrest
Berman	Cramer	Gillmor
Berry	Crane	Gilman
Biggert	Crenshaw	Goode
Bilirakis	Crowley	Goodlatte
Bishop	Cubin	Gordon
Blagojevich	Culberson	Goss
Blunt	Cunningham	Graham
Boehlert	Davis (CA)	Granger
Boehner	Davis (FL)	Graves
Bonilla	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (TX)
Bonior	Davis, Tom	Green (WI)
Bono	Deal	Greenwood
Boozman	DeFazio	Grucci
Borski	DeLay	Gutknecht
Boswell	DeMint	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Diaz-Balart	Hall (TX)
Boyd	Dicks	Hansen
Brady (TX)	Dingell	Harman
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Hart
Brown (SC)	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Bryant	Doyle	Hayes
Burr	Dreier	Hayworth
Buyer	Dunn	Hefley

Herger	McCollum
Hilleary	McCrery
Hincheey	McHugh
Hinojosa	McInnis
Hobson	McIntyre
Hoeffel	McKeon
Hoekstra	McNulty
Holden	Meeke (FL)
Hooley	Mica
Horn	Miller, Dan
Hostettler	Miller, Gary
Houghton	Miller, Jeff
Hoyer	Moore
Hulshof	Moran (KS)
Hunter	Moran (VA)
Hyde	Morella
Isakson	Murtha
Israel	Myrick
Issa	Nethercutt
Istook	Ney
Jenkins	Northup
John	Norwood
Johnson (CT)	Nussle
Johnson (IL)	Obey
Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
Johnson, Sam	Osborne
Jones (NC)	Ose
Kanjorski	Oxley
Kaptur	Pence
Keller	Peterson (MN)
Kelly	Peterson (PA)
Kennedy (MN)	Petri
Kennedy (RI)	Phelps
Kerns	Pickering
Kildee	Pitts
Kind (WI)	Platts
King (NY)	Pombo
Kingston	Pomeroy
Kirk	Portman
Knollenberg	Price (NC)
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)
LaFalce	Putnam
LaHood	Quinn
Lampson	Radanovich
Langevin	Ramstad
Lantos	Regula
Larsen (WA)	Rehberg
Latham	Reyes
LaTourrette	Reynolds
Leach	Riley
Levin	Roemer
Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)
Linder	Rohrabacher
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
LoBiondo	Ross
Lowe	Rothman
Lucas (KY)	Roukema
Lucas (OK)	Royce
Luther	Ryan (WI)
Lynch	Ryun (KS)
Maloney (CT)	Sanders
Manzullo	Sandlin
Matheson	Saxton
Matsui	Schaffer
McCarthy (MO)	Schiff
McCarthy (NY)	Schrock

NOES—101

Abercrombie	Frank
Baca	Gephardt
Baldwin	Gonzalez
Barrett	Gutierrez
Becerra	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	Hill
Brady (PA)	Hilliard
Brown (OH)	Holt
Capuano	Honda
Carson (IN)	Inslee
Clay	Jackson (IL)
Clayton	Jackson-Lee
Clyburn	(TX)
Condit	Jefferson
Conyers	Jones (OH)
Coyne	Kilpatrick
Cummings	Kleczka
Davis (IL)	Kucinich
DeGette	Larson (CT)
Delahunt	Lee
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)
Doggett	Lofgren
Duncan	Maloney (NY)
Engel	Markey
Evans	McGovern
Farr	McKinney
Fattah	Meehan
Finer	Meeke (NY)
Flake	Menendez
Ford	

Sensenbrenner	Solis
Sessions	Stark
Shadegg	Strickland
Shaw	Thompson (MS)
Shays	Tierney
Sherman	Towns
Sherwood	Udall (NM)
Shimkus	Velazquez
Shows	Visclosky
Shuster	Waters
Simmons	
Simpson	
Skeen	
Skelton	Burton
Slaughter	Deutsch
Smith (MI)	Emerson
Smith (NJ)	Mascara
Smith (TX)	
Smith (WA)	
Snyder	
Souder	
Spratt	
Stearns	
Stenholm	
Stump	
Stupak	
Sullivan	
Sununu	
Sweeney	
Tancred	
Tanner	
Tauscher	
Tauzin	
Taylor (MS)	
Taylor (NC)	
Terry	
Thomas	
Thompson (CA)	
Thornberry	
Thune	
Thurman	
Tiahrt	
Tiberti	
Toomey	
Turner	
Udall (CO)	
Upton	
Vitter	
Walden	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Watkins (OK)	
Watts (OK)	
Waxman	
Weiner	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
Wexler	
Whitfield	
Wicker	
Wilson (NM)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wolf	
Wu	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

NOT VOTING—6

	Watson (CA)
	Watt (NC)
	Woolsey
	Wynn
	McDermott
	Traficant

□ 1629

Messrs. SAWYER, RAHALL and HOLT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2002 through 2004 for the United States Custom Service for antiterrorism, drug interdiction, and other operations, for the Office of the United States Trade Representative, for the United States International Trade Commission, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3129.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1630

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 877

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 877.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4775, 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 428 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 428

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived except as follows: page 4, lines 18 through 23; page 57, line 6, through page 58, line 22; page 92, lines 3 through 5. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 353, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution.

(b) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record—

(1) the allocations contemplated by section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which shall be considered to be such allocations under a concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) "Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations," which shall be considered to be the programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to section 301(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 353; and

(3) an estimated unified surplus, which shall be considered to be the estimated unified surplus set forth in the report of the Committee on the Budget accompanying House Concurrent Resolution 353 referred to in section 211 of such concurrent resolution.

(c) The allocation referred to in section 231(d) of House Concurrent Resolution 353 shall be considered to be the corresponding allocation among those submitted by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget under subsection (b)(1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is an open rule that provides for consideration of H.R. 4775, the Supple-

mental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, and it waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Additionally, amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

This rule also contains a very important deeming provision as we move into the appropriations season, and it is important that we address this. Upon passage of this resolution, the rule provides that House Concurrent Resolution 353, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect as though adopted by Congress. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. This wartime supplemental comes 8 months after the September 11 attacks against our Nation. While Americans have begun the process of healing and recovery, we must be mindful of the threats that continue to face our Nation. The alerts and intelligence reports that we receive are constant reminders that the war against terrorism is far from over.

After last September, America responded by fortifying our homeland and launching an aggressive global war on terrorism. Mr. Speaker, this wartime supplemental is absolutely critical to our continued ability to fight and win this war.

There are a number of important provisions in this bill, but none more important than the funds that will go towards helping America win this war on terrorism, both abroad and at home. The bill provides \$15.77 billion for the Department of Defense. This money will go towards ongoing military operation costs, personnel costs, and costs associated with forced mobilization. Fighting the war is expensive, and this effort is no exception. However, I believe that the American people are united in their support for making sure that our military has the necessary resources to carry out its mission of insuring our national security. In short, we need to help our President to make sure that our military and the men and women who are dealing not only in law enforcement, but also our military, have the necessary elements to win.

Mr. Speaker, with the frequent announcement of possible terrorist attacks, many Americans are dealing with a sense of fear about our future. I want to emphasize that this bill addresses this uncertainty about the future and will hopefully help to instill confidence in people.

Priorities and funding have been given to allow our intelligence operations to track, analyze, and prosecute global terrorist threats against the United States and our allies. With the \$1.5 billion included in the supplemental, intelligence funding has increased to record levels since Sep-

tember 11. This bill also provides funds to improve the Federal Bureau of Investigation's technology systems. These additional funds will enhance the FBI's overall counterterrorism and intelligence processing capabilities, allowing for better electronic sharing of information between Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

In addition to protecting our national security, this wartime supplemental also provides funds to help secure our homeland.

One area of particular attention since September 11 has been Immigration and Naturalization, the INS Service, and its operations. In March 2002, the INS mailed a letter to a Florida flight school informing them that Mohammed Atta and another hijacker had been approved for student visas. Needless to say, many still-shaken Americans were very concerned when this news came out.

The supplemental builds on what Congress has already done to address this issue, and provides additional money to the INS to help them better account for individuals who have committed immigration violations and who have not followed orders to leave this country.

Since last September, a number of changes have been implemented to improve safety at our airports. For those of us who fly frequently, these changes can take some getting used to. I must confess that I too have been pulled out of the line and searched from head to toe on more than one occasion.

However, these safety changes are necessary to restore confidence in our airlines. Americans should be further assured because this bill provides additional funds for checking baggage, explosive inspection systems, as well as baggage screening and security enhancement at United States commercial ports. Other initiatives targeted at improving our homeland security include funds for secure transportation of nuclear weapons and materials, as well as money for the increased security at nuclear weapons facilities.

After the September 11 attacks, this Congress acted with expediency to pass a \$40 billion emergency supplemental for recovery and to fight the war on terror. Today, we build upon our past efforts and continue to remember those who lost their lives in New York, Pennsylvania, and here in Washington, D.C. As our President has committed, and I quote our President, "We will direct every resource at our command, every means of diplomacy, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network."

This shared commitment means that we will continue to provide and fund whatever is necessary to winning the war on terrorism.

Yet this bill also advocates for fiscal discipline and restraint in other areas. On March 20 of this year, the House passed its budget resolution, H. Con.

Res. 353. However, the absence of a budget resolution conference report makes it necessary for us to consider language that would deem the House-passed budget resolution to be a conference report. In effect, this language would bind the House to the spending and revenue levels established in the budget resolution, and the corresponding 302(a) allocations, and any related rulemaking provisions.

This language is necessary both to establish parameters on discretionary spending and to implement such mandatory initiatives accommodated in the budget resolution such as a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, concurrent receipt of military retirement and veterans disability benefits, and a new tax benefit for charitable giving.

I want to take a minute to remind my colleagues that this House-passed budget was a carefully crafted bill that balanced our priorities of winning the war and securing our economic and personal security. From providing the largest increase in 20 years to the national defense to growing our economy and paying down the debt, this wartime budget makes America safer, the economy stronger, and secures the future for every single American.

I am pleased that the measure that is before us today recognizes the critical needs associated with our continued war effort, while maintaining our commitment to fiscal discipline. I urge my colleagues to support this open rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last week, congressional Republicans were caught using a September 11 Presidential photo as a fund-raising prop for their political campaigns. It was a particularly shameless sparing of political war profiteering, one that did an immense disservice to the President, as well as to the country. Unfortunately, Republican leaders have not learned their lesson, and they are trying to do it again today by confusing the public with this rule.

So let me speak very plainly about the question posed by the vote on the rule today. If we want to increase America's national debt and write a blank check to keep raiding the Social Security trust fund, then vote "yes" on this rule. If, on the other hand, we believe we should be honest with the American people and sit down together to work out a bipartisan plan to stop raiding Social Security, then vote "no" on this rule. That will force the Republican leaders to stop playing politics with the war, and then we can overwhelmingly pass a bipartisan emergency spending bill crafted by the Committee on Appropriations.

Under this rule, the Republican leadership attempts to sneak through a provision paving the way for raising the debt ceiling, without a straight up-

or-down vote on the issue. They are attempting to shield their weak-kneed Members from having to vote on putting us deep in debt. They want to put billions of dollars on the national credit card, without each putting the credit card through the credit card reader. They do not want a telltale receipt for their spending spree.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. The Committee on Appropriations has written a good bill that reflects our bipartisan support for national defense and homeland security. It is true that many Democrats believe we should do a lot more for homeland security, but the bill does provide substantial resources for priorities like safeguarding nuclear facilities in airports. Additionally, it provides more than the President requested for the Department of Defense, most of it for Operation Enduring Freedom, and the Committee on Appropriations has provided \$200 million for antiterrorism aid to Israel in its time of need.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, deserve credit for their good work. Unfortunately, the Republican leaders do not hold in high regard such work, so they have overruled the Committee on Appropriations chairman and have crafted a rule that shatters the spirit of bipartisanship and the underlying bill. It is a rule that uses the war on terrorism as cover to take care of as many Republican political problems as they can think of.

For example, last year some Republican Members were criticized at home for siding with the Republican leadership on the fast track trade authority bill, despite the fact that it was harmful to people in their districts. So today, the Republican leadership is using this rule to provide them a textile provision that they can claim is their reward.

Here is another example, Mr. Speaker. A couple of Republican Members would benefit from a provision in the rule that would increase Medicare reimbursement rates for doctors and hospitals in their particular districts. That might be a good thing, but it would cost doctors and hospitals in every other district in the country. In other words, it helps only a very small fraction of the country and does it at the expense of everyone else. So it requires careful consideration in the light of day, not a procedural trick on a wartime appropriations bill.

As I explained at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, the most important issues hidden in this bill are Social Security and the national debt. The economic plan Republicans passed last year created massive, long-term deficits that threatened Social Security; and now, not even 18 months after President Bush inherited historic budget surpluses, this administration says the Federal Government has to borrow

hundreds of billions of dollars more and put our children deeper into debt.

Democrats have repeatedly tried to sit down with the Republicans to work out a bipartisan solution to this threat to Social Security. Instead, just last night, in the Committee on Rules, four of the most fiscally conservative Members of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), offered yet another approach to restore fiscal responsibility, but were denied by the Republican leadership.

That is because the Republican leadership is deathly afraid that Americans will notice how much of the Social Security trust fund they are squandering under the programs. After all, the key to the secret Republican plan to privatize Social Security is to keep it sacred until after the elections. So instead of allowing a vote on the Bush administration's request to go deeper into debt, Republican leaders have hidden in this rule legislative language that will allow them to do it in the secrecy of a conference committee without a straight up-or-down vote on the floor of the House.

□ 1645

This is just plain dishonest, Mr. Speaker. But it makes the vote on the rule very simple, because it means that Republican leaders have made the vote on this rule a vote to increase America's national debts and keep raiding Social Security.

So if Members believe that the American people deserve an open debate and a straight up-or-down vote on the future of Social Security, vote against the rule. Then we can give the underlying supplemental appropriations bill the overwhelming bipartisan vote it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest parts about the rule that we are doing here today, is it is an open rule. We can stand up on the floor of the House and talk about whatever we want to talk about. We are not trying to sneak anything through. We are doing it right out in the open.

The light of day will be the best disinfectant, and that is why this debate is so powerful, because the truth can be told. We are going to tell the truth about this supplemental, because it is all about helping the United States and our military and men and women who are in law enforcement get the money that they need to keep this country going, and to make sure that we win this war. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mobile, Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is a great American, especially since he knew in advance that I was rising in opposition for the first time in my 18 years in Congress against a Republican rule before this House.

I do it out of principle and I do it in all good faith, not to be critical of the Committee on Rules, not to be critical of their goals, but to express some concerns that I have that I think are very important, and that is aid to Israel.

For Israel in this bill, suddenly, in the middle of the night, in the Committee on Appropriations, without any encouragement from Prime Minister Sharon, without any encouragement from Chairman Arafat, within the Beltway some decided that we ought to give Israel \$200 million in economic support, and give Mr. Arafat's area \$50 million in economic support.

But to bring some history to the House, to ask Members to reflect back to 1997 when Prime Minister Netanyahu came before this very body, stood right in front of the Speaker and told this body that it was time for Israel to wean themselves of American economic support because their economy was better than ours. When Mr. Netanyahu said that, I immediately arranged a trip. I sat down with Mr. Netanyahu. I sat down with him, just the 2 of us. We worked out a process to wean Israel of all economic support, because they said it was no longer needed.

Along with that, at the same time we were giving Mr. Mubarak in Egypt a proportional sum of money. Two-thirds of whatever Israel got, Egypt got; not necessarily good foreign policy, but that was the policy that has been in effect since Camp David.

So I went to Cairo and I talked to President Mubarak, and he, too, agreed that Egypt would be reduced, just as Israel was, provided that Israel did not come in the back door and try to bump up their economic support without considering Egypt.

So I went before the Committee on Rules and asked for an opportunity to present this amendment to this body, on this bill, to give the proportional amount of money to Egypt, but I was for some reason denied.

But at the same time, some of the other areas Members of Congress wanted to be considered, such as the wage indexing problem in Pennsylvania with respect to Medicare reimbursement. It is also a problem in another 30 States. Yet, somehow or another, in this bill a self-executing rule says that Pennsylvania's problems will be resolved, but no other State will be resolved, so we will be left out in the cold on the indexing of Medicare payments to hospitals in the State of Alabama. Why they would give them that and not give me this simple opportunity to present an amendment for an up-or-down vote is beyond comprehension.

I also am upset about the deeming resolution, an unnecessary provision

that is placed in this bill for the first time that I can ever recollect since the Republicans have been in charge, an unnecessary provision that is going to cause havoc and chaos as we go through the appropriation process in the next several months.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, for the first time, I think I am going to have to vote against this rule. I am not lobbying people to vote against it, but I am just expressing my own consternation, my own fears, my own principles.

I am going to offer amendments as we go through the bill to strike all of the aid to Israel that was included here without any request from Israel, without any request from the administration, without any requests from anybody. But someone within this beltway decided since we were going to have a supplemental bill, they were going to get some pork in it for Israel.

It is wrong to do that in this bill at this time. We will have a foreign operations bill on this floor in the next couple of weeks. That would be the appropriate time to address any economic support increase for Israel, not in an emergency supplemental bill. It was not included in the President's request, and it was not even requested by the government of Israel. It is the wrong thing to be doing.

Many Members know in their hearts that I am right, but they feel politically they cannot vote for it. I know in my heart that I am not going to win my amendments, but I am going to give people an opportunity to at least vote to see whether or not we ought to be doing out foreign aid in this emergency supplemental bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we all come here individually as politicians, and as we are assigned committees, as we develop expertise on substance, we become legislators, rather than mere politicians.

On the Committee on Appropriations, I think it is safe to say that we can take people with the most extreme ideological differences, and if we send them out in the field to examine a problem, when they come back to this Chamber, 8 times out of 10 they will probably have the same ideas about how to deal with the problem. That is what happens in a legislative body when we have the normal course of give-and-take and the normal willingness to compromise.

That is not just true of the Committee on Appropriations; it is supposed to happen on every other committee in the Congress. That is what is supposed to turn us into what we have been called when we have been called "the greatest legislative, deliberative body in the world."

But we have fallen a far, far pace from that on this bill. At least 6 times on major legislation, on patients' pro-

tection, the energy bill, the Airline Security Act, the Patriot Act, the pension reform, and welfare-to-work, each time, rather than running these bills through the committee process and accepting the committee result, we have seen the majority party leadership instead dictate a different result and dictate that a different package be brought to the floor. We are seeing the same thing here.

We had a bipartisan bill which was the product of 6 weeks of hard work between the 2 parties on the Committee on Appropriations. Then when the committee went into full committee, a number of amendments were adopted. Some of them I did not like, but with the exception of the DeLay amendment, which gave the President the authority to engage in a military attack on The Netherlands, I basically had no real problem with what the committee did.

But then it went to the Committee on Rules, and the instructions came down from on high that a number of extraneous items should be added to the bill. The first was that the House would deem that the budget resolution brought out by the Committee on the Budget months ago would be deemed now in effect.

That produces for discretionary funding in the next fiscal year a level \$10 billion below the level being spent this fiscal year.

In the end, any knowledgeable Member of this House on either side of the aisle, and most especially knowledgeable Members on the Committee on Appropriations, understands that that is not deliverable.

I do not believe that we will find a majority of votes on either side of the aisle for the education bill, for instance, that would be produced as a result of those limitations because I do not believe either party is going to cut President Bush's education budget. But that is what it requires.

But the biggest outrage of all is this: We have in this rule a proposition which will allow seemingly innocuous language to be added, which is really the door-opener in order to raise the national debt, the limit on the national indebtedness, the limit on the Nation's credit card, by \$750 billion.

The plan is to have the Senate insert increased debt, and then have it come back here wrapped in a package so that no Member ever has to actually vote on that freestanding item. Yet they will force an increase in the Nation's credit card debt.

□ 1700

And this proposition is being brought to us by a lot of the same people for the last year that have been parading all over this floor, talking about how they were going to support a constitutional amendment. This is a copy of H.J. Res. 86. There are 110 Republican sponsors on this resolution to require that not a dime of additional debt could be added without having a three-

fifths vote of this House. Yet today this would facilitate raising the debt without individual Members having to stand up and take the heat for that vote. And if you take a look at the people who are listed on it, I would ask all of them how they can justify putting their names on this resolution and telling their constituents that they are against raising the debt without a full firm vote on it and then engaging in this sleight of hand.

This resolution is sponsored by people like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY); the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE); the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP); the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), my own State; and a variety of others. I would ask each and every one of them, how can you justify going to your constituents and saying you are going pass this constitutional amendment and then you flip-flop and come back here and do this?

I do not think this process does a credit to the House, and I do not think it is a real process. I think it delays delivering money to the Pentagon that we need to get to the Pentagon in order to reimburse them for the costs of the war.

This day, if we proceed to pass this rule, will not go down as one of the glory days in the history of the House.

BILL SUMMARY AND STATUS FOR THE 107TH CONGRESS

COSPONSORS, ALPHABETICAL

Bachus, Spencer	Akin, W. Todd
Barr, Bob	Baker, Richard H.
Barton, Joe	Bartlett, Roscoe G.
Bilirakis, Michael	Bass, Charles F.
Blunt, Roy	
Bono, Mary	Boehner, John A.
Brady, Kevin	Boozman, John
Bryant, Ed	Brown, Henry E., Jr.
Calvert, Ken	Burton, Dan
Cantor, Eric	Cannon, Chris
Chabot, Steve	Castle, Michael N.
Combest, Larry	Chambliss, Saxby
Crane, Philip M.	
Culberson, John Abney	Crenshaw, Ander
Davis, Jo Ann	Deal, Nathan
Dunn, Jennifer	DeMint, Jim
English, Phil	Duncan, John J., Jr.
Forbes, J. Randy	
Gekas, George W.	Fletcher, Ernest L.
Goodlatte, Bob	Ganske, Greg
Graves, Sam	Graham, Lindsey O.
	Gutknecht, Gil
Hart, Melissa A.	Hansen, James V.
Hayworth, J.D.	Hastings, Doc
Herger, Wally	Hefley, Joel
Hoekstra, Peter	Hilleary, Van
Isakson, Johnny	Horn, Stephen
Jenkins, William L.	Issa, Darrell E.
Johnson, Sam	
Keller, Ric	Jones, Walter B., Jr.
Kerns, Brian D.	Kennedy Mark R.
Kirk, Mark Steven	LaTourrette, Steve C.
Lewis, Ron	Linder, John
Lucas, Frank D.	Manzullo, Donald A.
McCrey, Jim	McKeon, Howard P. (Buck)
Myrick, Sue	Miller, Jeff
Nussle, Jim	Norwood, Charlie
Ose, Doug	Osborne, Tom
Pence, Mike	Otter, C. L. (Butch)
Pitts, Joseph R.	Platts, Todd Russell
Pombo, Richard W.	Pryce, Deborah
Radanovich, George P.	Rohrabacher, Dana
Rehberg, Dennis R.	Ryan, Paul
Royce, Edward R.	Schaffer, Bob
Ryun, Jim	Sessions, Pete
Schrock, Edward L.	Shuster, Bill
Shimkus, John	Simpson, Michael A.
Simmons, Rob	
Stearns, Cliff	Terry, Lee

COSPONSORS, ALPHABETICAL—Continued

Sullivan, John R.	Tiberi, Patrick J.
Tancredo, Thomas G.	Walden, Greg
Thune, John R.	Weller, Jerry
Toomey, Patrick J.	Wilson, Joe

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from San Dimas, California, (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time, and I congratulate him on his management of this rule.

This is obviously a great challenge. It is important to note that this rule is for consideration of a wartime supplemental appropriations bill. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) described this before our Republican conference yesterday very appropriately as a wartime supplemental appropriations bill.

What has happened in the last 24 hours? We have seen an increased threat of terrorism. We have seen instability in a wide range of areas in the world; and this administration is, I believe, doing the best job possible to deal with this. The President months ago asked for a supplemental appropriations bill that would provide Israel with the resources necessary.

Now, a number of people who have been speaking against this have talked about some other issues. Let us remember, 99 percent, Mr. Speaker, of this legislation deals with supplemental appropriations for our war efforts. Now, we have heard talk about what some have said is an unprecedented use of the deeming process. Well, my Democratic colleagues had something known as the Gephardt amendment which regularly deemed an automatic increase in the debt ceiling. We, in the past several years, have had three occasions, had a deeming of the budget, of parts of the budget before. So I think it is very important to note that this is a very challenging time.

We are dealing with a situation which will begin here and then move to a joint House/Senate conference. My friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), raised the issue of Egypt. We know that this administration is determined to do everything that it possibly can to bring about peace and stability in the Middle East. It is a challenge. Administrations in the past have tried and failed. But we know under the stellar leadership of President Bush, Vice President Chaney, the National Security Advisor, Dr. Rice and Colin Powell and Donald Rumsfeld, that we have a wonderful team working on this. That is why I believe it is important for us to provide the support the administration wants. And, yes, he is right that the administration did not make the additional request for aid to Israel, but there is no indication that the President would not be supportive of what is taking place here, because we clearly stand by our ally, the State of Israel, the one

democratically elected government in the region.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe we need to realize that our number one priority is to win the war on terrorism. And to do that, as the President and others have said, we have to have the resources necessary to win that war. And that is why every Member of this House should vote in favor of this rule and in favor of the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I listened to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). If we really wanted to help the war effort, strip all this extraneous nonsense out of the bill, strip all of these baubles that they are trying to use to buy votes on the other side on Medicare and trade and all this other stuff and just do a supplemental that provides the money to fight the war. That is all you need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) said is that we are at war and the Committee on Rules has now usurped all the responsibilities of the standing committee. It really makes no difference what the Committee on Appropriations wants to do, what the Committee on International Relations wants to do, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Ways and Means. The President of the United States and the chairman of the Committee on Rules, they will decide what is the best for this great country and for the Congress.

Imagine that in this appropriation we have issues that we hold sacred in the Committee on Ways and Means. That is the budget ceiling where we debate among each other as to what it is going to be. But instead of just coming out and saying that the Committee on Rules has decided that we have got to raise the debt ceiling, instead of doing that, what do you put in here?

Again, you wave the flag and say that the Committee on Rules has dictated that the Government of the United States will take all steps necessary to guarantee the full faith and credit of the government.

Is this gobbledygook? Is this patriotism or is this stealing the jurisdiction of another committee? What you mean to say is we will find some sneaky way to get the debt ceiling increase by passing a nothing rule over here and allowing the Senate to take our jurisdiction and to bring it back, wrap it up in the flag and dare someone during wartime to vote against it.

What is the next thing he is going to do? Oh, the Committee on Rules now knows how to handle Medicare. Not the Committee on Energy and Commerce, not the Committee on Ways and Means, not the House. What you have decided is there are certain hospitals in

Republican districts that are in trouble, and you are going to give them assistance at the expense of other hospitals. Is it in here? Yes.

Lastly, you are going to violate trade agreements in the rule. Shame on you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his strong leadership on this rule which will bring before the Congress today a critical piece of legislation, a supplemental appropriations bill for a Nation that is at war.

The President of the United States comes to this Congress and asks for supplemental assistance, and this Congress provides it today: \$15.7 billion in national defense, \$5.8 billion in homeland security. And, Mr. Speaker, we commit ourselves in this rule and in this measure to live within our means as a Congress. In the months ahead as we consider appropriations, we commit ourselves to the budget resolution that has been passed by the so-named deeming elements of this rule.

These are the priorities of the Nation, Mr. Speaker: a national defense and prosecuting the war, homeland defense as we hear recriminations and discussions of what was done and what not done prior to September 11. The American people want us to respond in this Congress to these needs, and they want us to live within our means and to practice the fiscal discipline for which this majority is so rightly celebrated.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, there has been talk about the \$200 million for Israel. I, being one of the Members who have called upon the leadership and urged the leadership despite the lack of the call for the administration to add to these funds, I see them as perfectly appropriate to a defense supplemental bill: 493 Israelis have been killed since September of 2000; 3,955 wounded. Israel has spent \$255 million in their front in this war on terrorism in the third and fourth week of Operation Defensive Shield alone.

America must stand by Israel in her darkest hour. Let us do no less than those we remember on this Memorial Day. Let us do our duty.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Members to vote "no" against this rule.

Over 1 year ago, Republicans passed an economic plan. They said at the time that their plan would generate economic growth, protect the surplus that we built up in the 1990s, and safeguard Social Security. Republicans en-

acted a giant tax bill for the wealthy, while promising that there would be enough room in the budget for Social Security, education, Medicare prescription drugs, and the defense of the United States of America.

Today, Republicans are making it clear that they are refusing to confront the consequences of their economic plan.

This rule is an outrage. It places full faith and credit language in the bill to avoid a desperate request by the President's Secretary of the Treasury to bail the administration out of the economic folly of their own making. It hides the fact that Republicans took a record surplus, turned it into a huge and mounting deficit, and put Social Security in jeopardy. It makes a mockery of the Republican rhetoric to safeguard the trust fund. It makes a mockery of the Republican votes to create a lockbox. It ignores and it weakens our intergenerational contract and commitment in the 21st century.

Instead, Republicans refuse to work with Democrats. They deny debate on a plan the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) sought to offer. That plan provides a way out of spending the Social Security surplus. It puts Social Security first, not last. It is sensible. It is responsible. It is the right thing to do for the American people.

Republicans did not give it one second of time on this floor today. They are silencing the voices of the American people on the future of Social Security. Now is not the time to give the Federal Government carte blanche to run up the debt. Our economic future is at stake. People's retirement security is on the line. We ought to be talking today about a 1-month extension of the debt limit. We ought to be coming back here in the next month to talk about how to fix this problem. We ought to have a budget summit between the President and the bipartisan Congress to find out how we can write a budget that is in tune with the changed circumstances that we have faced since September 11. We need to bring both parties and the President to the table, and we need the parties to work together. We need communication. We need collaboration to put our fiscal house back in order, to save Social Security first and today.

The American people deserve a comprehensive, fair debate on Social Security. So I hope Members will vote "no" on this rule, and I hope Members in both parties would decide to vote "no" on this rule.

I can tell you that every family who lost somebody on September 11 has been around the dining room table trying to figure out a new budget because of their changed circumstances. Well, America had a tragedy on September 11, and, as a family, we ought to be sitting around the table in respect and honesty to work out a new budget for this country. We cannot do that through gag rules that silence the

voices of the American people on this side of the aisle. Vote "no" against this rule.

□ 1715

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Evidently we have failed to communicate this openly to all Members. This is an open rule. This is an open rule for any Member of Congress, including the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), to offer any sort of amendment that he would like to. This is no gag rule. This is no sham. This is no trick. By presenting an open rule, it means that both sides are presented an equal opportunity to present their case.

There has been a lot said today about Social Security. The fact of the matter is that there is a part of this rule that says, "The United States Government shall take all steps necessary to guarantee the full faith and credit of the government." That is what we are trying to do.

We are trying to make sure that this supplemental bill has an opportunity to be debated under an open rule today to where we have an opportunity to pass this bill and to where we can engage the other body, the Senate, which is controlled by the other party, the other body who controls that, to where we can work together as Republicans, as Democrats, with the President of the United States.

The fact of the matter is the song is always the same. The bottom line is that for years a clear majority of Democrats have been opposed to funding the military, and that is exactly the same way it is today. This is about funding our military. This is about a wartime budget. This is about trying to make sure that we win the war.

I know where the opposition comes from. We hear it over and over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am under the impression that the Chair has to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has been recognized for 2 minutes.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi will state his point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, that I believe a parliamentary inquiry has precedence over that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would respond to the gentleman that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) had yielded 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). The gentleman from California had the floor. The gentleman from Mississippi was not yielded to for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry. The floor belonged to the gentleman from California who has been recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned on speaking but the minority leader came to the floor, and he talked about Social Security trust fund safeguards, tax breaks for the rich, Social Security, Medicare, prescription drugs.

Let me remind my colleagues that not a single Democrat economic package went forward when President Clinton was President. None of my colleagues' policies went forward. We passed them to create a surplus by welfare reform, by tax relief, by stimulus packages, whatsoever. Matter of fact, in 1993, the Democrats, when they had the entire majority of the House, the Senate and the White House, increased the tax on the middle class. They took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund. They increased Social Security taxes. They cut military COLAs and veterans' COLAs. So do not tell me about saving Social Security.

I have been waiting for this debate. I have in my office the leadership of the Democrat party, since every one of them have been here, the number of times that they have voted to cut the Social Security trust fund, which I am going to submit. So do not talk to us about cutting the Social Security trust fund. It is just rhetoric.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry, would the open rule the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) makes reference to allow me to offer an amendment that would remove the language that allows this bill to raise the debt limit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to deliver an anticipatory ruling on what may later occur in Committee of the Whole if the gentleman were to attempt or any Member would attempt to offer certain amendments.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it would be my understanding that an open rule would allow me to offer any amendment that I wish to keep the Republican majority from

raising the debt limit and plunging us more than \$6 trillion in debt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to construe the resolution which the House is debating at this time. That is a proper subject for debate among Members.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, when the Chair is construing whether or not a Member can offer an amendment, is that in itself limiting the rules of the House and, therefore, not an open rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is a difference in the Chair interpreting or construing a resolution which the House has already adopted and the Chair giving an interpretation of a resolution which is currently under consideration and the subject of debate in the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if I may understand, the passage of this rule would indeed prohibit me or any other Member of this House from offering an amendment that would keep us from raising the debt limit. Does that not in itself constitute a restrictive rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would respond that the Chair has already answered the gentleman's question. The Chair is not in a position to construe or characterize resolutions which are currently pending before the body.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, who would be in a position to construe that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously stated, that is a proper subject of debate when debating the resolution.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Under the rule pending, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) would not have the opportunity to offer their amendment that has previously been described on the debt ceiling. That is fact. This is not an open rule. They would be prevented from offering their amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because it takes another giant step, a big step in the Republican march toward fiscal recklessness that has characterized their performance in the 107th Congress. The majority has done everything possible to hide, hide from the American people the fact that

this rule allows the second largest increase in the Nation's debt limit ever.

The Republican tax cut has already driven the Nation back into deficit spending. As a result, every penny of this back-door increase in the debt limit will come from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

We all agree, Mr. Speaker, that additional resources are needed to meet our Nation's defense and homeland security needs. We all support that, Democrat and Republican alike.

As the senior Democrat on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I understand full well the investments that are necessary for a strong response to the ongoing terrorist threat must be met. However, I must say shame on the Republican majority for hiding their raising of the debt limit and their raid on Social Security and Medicare behind our legitimate need to protect our forces and to protect our country.

It is possible to fight terrorism and put forth a fiscally responsible budget, but the Republican leadership has failed to do so. Again and again we have heard excuses from the majority that they attempt to explain the dramatic shift from surpluses to deficits and the raid on Social Security and Medicare trust funds that has resulted. A wartime budget, a recession, forecast errors, the list goes on. The question remains, where is the plan to get us out of this mess? Why should we sign a blank check to pay for the Republican tax cut by raiding Social Security and Medicare?

Last year, the majority said they had an economic plan that would pay down the maximum amount of debt possible and promise to protect the entire Social Security surplus. Today, they are requesting the second largest increase in the debt limit in our Nation's history to continue their raid on Social Security and Medicare. We have to have an up-or-down vote on their stealth plan to mortgage our children's future.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The song is always the same. The bottom line is that for years a clear majority of Democrats have been opposed to funding the military, and today is no different.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 12¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have heard any number of reasons why this is a bad rule. Let me give my colleagues another one.

If this rule passes, one of our premier airlines is liable to go out of business because this rule specifically protects language that terminates the airline loan guarantee program. After the events of September 11, we passed legislation knowing that the airlines were hurting, knowing that some of them could go into insolvency.

One airline in particular, U.S. Air, is headquartered at Washington's National Airport. Washington National Airport was closed down for an entire month, and for 8 months it has only had partial service. So understandably U.S. Airways has not had the revenue to stay afloat. That is what this loan guarantee program was for, but this rule protects \$1.3 billion in savings by terminating the program because it knows that that is the amount of money that U.S. Airways needs to stay afloat.

So we are forcing an airline into bankruptcy, 40,000 jobs, 204 cities served. Now, this is not what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wanted. This is not what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) wanted. They have been trying to work it out along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS). They have been trying to do the right thing, but this rule does the wrong thing. It is outrageous to try to save money through this kind of a budget gimmick and cause the loss of 40,000 jobs, and think of what it is going to do to the economy of 204 cities that are served by U.S. Air. Unbelievable.

This rule needs to get defeated. It is one of the worst rules to come before the House of Representatives.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I could, engage with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) and let him know that the time appears to be unbalanced at this point, and I would like to see if he would like to get us to more of an even stance.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to yield additional time at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule for many reasons, and not because I am opposed to defense funding. If this were a clean increase for the war in Afghanistan, it would be passed unanimously.

First of all, this rule deems what the House could not do directly. It deems the budget resolution and sets the discretionary spending ceiling at \$759 billion. That is \$9 billion less than the other body. Mark my word, that \$9 billion discrepancy will cause us problems before this fiscal year is out.

The second reason to get the votes necessary for passage, the rule claims \$1.2 billion in savings to offset the amendments that the committee added in the supplemental over and above the

President's request. The largest amount of these comes from obligatory delays. They are not saying they are obligatory delays.

The rule would prevent the Air Transportation Stabilization Board from guaranteeing any more airline loans for the rest of this fiscal year, but beginning the next fiscal year, they could make those loans. Someone may say that is harmless. Not for U.S. Air. It is a matter of life and death for U.S. Air because they told us they need funding by August 1. So it saves no money, but it does not do U.S. Air any good at all.

Most of all, I am really upset with this rule because it gets too clever by half, much too coy when it comes to something that is gravely serious, and that is the debt owed by the United States of America. We are creeping up on our statutory debt limits, and rather than face up to this issue squarely, this rule makes passing reference to the statutory debt ceiling just enough to have this matter originate in the House and leaves the heavy lifting to the other body.

□ 1730

What it seeks to avoid most of all is a direct vote on this very important issue, and our constituents need to know where we stand.

Now, we would have offered, if the committee had made it in order, an amendment that would have offered a suitable procedure for undertaking something this serious. It simply would have provided that if we take up the debt ceiling, we can increase it by \$250 billion, but if we increase it by any more we must have in place a budget resolution that will put the budget in balance in 5 fiscal years.

That amendment was not made in order, which is another reason to vote against the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, why can we not just for once be honest with the American people?

Every single Member of this body is in favor of supporting our troops in Afghanistan. And any rhetoric notwithstanding is not being honest. Everyone that makes statements like my friend from Texas made a moment ago knows better than that. The war on terrorism is too serious to play political games with.

To call this rule an open rule is laughable. The answer to the question of my colleague from Mississippi, Mr. Speaker, is no, he will be held out of order when he offers an amendment to pay for this war and not charge it to our grandchildren.

I cannot imagine how anybody that purports to be a conservative would support this resolution and this rule if they look at the scoring that is being

applied, and then saying to their colleagues it is being paid for, when my colleagues know better.

Back in 1994, I joined with 321 of my colleagues, including 166 Republicans that are still here, that said we ought to put a stop to emergency spending bills having nonemergency issues being added to them. It passed 322 to 99. There were only four Republicans that opposed it in 1994. Then in 1995, when the Republicans took over the majority, they thought it was a darned good rule and they put it in saying when we have emergency spending, we ought to confine the issues and the spending to emergencies. Yet this rule waives any amendment that strikes any of those spending bills that are not emergency, because suddenly my Republican colleagues have seen the light and they believe that spending for any purpose is okay; but yet they are going to call themselves conservatives.

A vote for this rule is a vote for using parliamentary tricks to sneak an increase in the debt limit into law without addressing the fiscal problems highlighted by the need to increase the debt limit. That is my opposition to this rule. That is my opposition to this bill.

My colleagues should be open and honest and come out and say they are in favor of increasing the debt of this country \$750 billion. But they choose to hide it. That is wrong and it is not honest.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, if the Democrats had proposed this rule, I would be up here speaking against it. This rule is, I think I will put it this way, if I were doing business with someone who devised or ran their business like this rule, I would quit doing business with them immediately; and I think the American people ought to as well.

What my Republican colleagues have done with this rule is they have made passing reference to the statutory assurance that the United States take all necessary means to protect our credit, which is the debt ceiling, and then they have provided that the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules shall be considered as adopted. That is not an open rule and they know it.

No one can call that an open rule. We cannot get at striking section 1403 because it will be held out of order. So when my colleagues say it is an open rule, it is not and my colleagues know it. It is crystal clear that it is wrong. It is dead wrong.

We are engaged in a generational mugging of the next generation here because we will not face up to what we are trying to do to pay for this. It is wrong.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I just want to say that I support this rule, and I will support the supplemental bill as well. I am supporting the rule and the bill because of three things, three important things that it does.

Number one, it continues the war internationally against terrorism; number two, it protects our homeland; and, number three, it helps complete the job of rebuilding New York City.

Just to go through some of these things. This wartime supplemental provides \$15.7 billion to aid the troops in the ongoing war. I have visited Afghanistan and Central Asia and the countries of Tajikistan, Pakistan, and Uzbekistan. They need our support. It is not time to turn our back on them.

This bill secures our homeland as well with \$850 million for checking baggage for explosive devices, \$630 million for baggage screening and \$75 million for security enhancements at commercial ports.

Just to give one statistic, Savannah, Georgia, which I represent, last year brought in one million containers. Of those containers, only 1 percent were checked. This bill helps address that problem.

This bill also, in the name of homeland security, provides local law enforcement the tools that they need to track down terrorism. How often do my colleagues get these calls, which I know I have been getting since 9-11, from the local police officers and the sheriff departments: they have seen something suspicious, but they do not know who to call or what to do. This helps them hook in with the national tracking system.

It also helps our communities in terms of disaster preparation. One of the issues we have to deal with is the EMS folks, training them and getting them up to speed on what is needed. I think that it is very important that we continue to work with our local law enforcement training people.

Then, finally, our \$5.5 billion to help build New York City, that great city which we in America all love and like to talk about.

This bill is about making sure we never forget what happened to our Nation on 9-11, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we all want to take care of the troops. What a lot of us do not want to do is to lie to the American people and mislead them and tell them we are not borrowing money to do it.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) misspoke, and I am going to leave it at that, when he said they are paying down the national debt. In the past 1 year, the national debt has risen by \$323,329,559,211.21. Now that is straight off the Treasury report. Do not tell the people that we are bal-

ancing the budget. My colleagues are suggesting that we vote to increase the debt limit by \$750 billion. That is a thousand times a thousand times a thousand times 750.

If we have to pay for this war, and we should, then let us cut spending someplace else, like the American people do.

I would tell the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) that on the day my daughter was born our Nation was less than \$1 trillion in debt. The gentleman is proposing that we go over \$6 trillion in debt, and she is not yet 24 years old. Where does it stop? Where is the shame?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What the majority party, my Republican Party, is trying to do is to make sure that our President, that our law enforcement, that our military has the money that is necessary to fight this war. It is not a war we wanted to get into; it was a war that was thrust on America on September 11. It was a war that America was thrust in and now our President and our Vice President are leading our Nation.

We all saw the destruction and the damage that happened. We stood up with pride and in awe of the men and women of the New York City Fire Department and Police Department as they battled these terrorists and then looked after the people of New York. We, as Members of this body, responded within days. We are now trying to respond again.

We believe it is honest and forthright that we follow procedures that people out in Dallas, Texas, and all across this country understand, not just in my congressional district but all the Members, when we say that we are trying to do the things that the President has asked for and that are in the best interest of this country to fund our military and law enforcement and the men and women who protect not only our borders but our parameters well out, including Afghanistan and our allies.

What we have said is very plain and simple. We are following a constitutional process where we have to go and negotiate with another body called the United States Senate. We are trying to make sure that while this negotiation is going on that we can say that the United States Government shall take all steps necessary to guarantee the full faith and credit of the government. I think to do anything different would be irresponsible.

I cannot say what the debt is going to do between now and the time we reach an agreement with the United States Senate and the President signs this bill. But what I can say is that we are responsible enough to say that the United States Government will stand up for what it should.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, in the previous comments, the majority manager of the bill has referred to this as an open rule. Therefore, under this open rule, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) be made in order in the ensuing debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Chair would respond that the gentleman's request is out of order. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has yielded to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for the purposes of debate only, not for the purposes of amending the rule, even under unanimous consent.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard over and over and over that this is a rule about the war. What the majority party has done is wrapped this rule in the flag and wrapped this rule in the war and is trying to hide the fact from the American people that they are trying to increase the credit card debt of this Nation by \$750 billion, three-quarters of a trillion dollars.

We all are Americans, we all stand together against terrorism, and we will all provide whatever resources and money are necessary to win this war on terrorism. But at the very least we should be, we should be, and we must be honest with the American people and tell them what it is we are doing. What the Republicans are attempting to do is to sneak through a \$750 billion increase in the debt limit here without a stand-alone vote.

That is absolutely wrong, because what my colleagues are going to do is to pass that debt on to our children and grandchildren. Shame. Shame.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that 1 year ago we were having a debate in this House about how much of the debt we could pay down. Today, the House is being asked to pass in this rule, having nothing to do with the underlying bill, a measure that will allow for the public debt of the Nation to increase by three-quarters of a trillion dollars without debating it in the light of day.

We have soldiers abroad who are fighting to defend the Constitution, yet we have the majority party which does not even want to allow the public to see the debate of whether or not we want to raise the national debt to pay for the war.

All of us support the war effort. There is not a Member on either side, that I am aware of, who is not in favor of the war effort.

□ 1745

But what is a shame is the fact that the Republicans want to slide a fast

one past the American people so they can have it both ways and say we can cut taxes and we are not going to increase the debt when in fact that is what they are doing. They are raising the national debt with this vote.

We should defeat this rule and start over and bring a clean supplemental up that every Member will vote for.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, having listened to the comments of the gentleman from Tennessee, my parliamentary inquiry is this: Would it take an amendment to change an open rule in order to make it open?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry which is appropriate for the Chair to answer.

Does the gentleman have a further parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is my understanding that this has been described by the majority as an open rule. Yet a few minutes ago, the Speaker said in response to the comments of the gentleman from Tennessee that it would require a change in the rule in order to make it an open rule.

My parliamentary inquiry is if this is an open rule, why would it require a change in the rule to make it an open rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would simply respond to the gentleman, the House has a mechanism to amend a pending rule if the House sees fit. The Chair responded in such a fashion earlier on several occasions.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the money that we are spending in this bill is for the national defense, and it is for men and women who protect us. Tonight when Americans go to sleep after hearing this great and vigorous debate, they can go to sleep knowing that this House is talking about the things that are important to make sure that our sons and brothers and fathers and aunts and uncles, the freedoms that we enjoy as a result of this House talking about the debate that will get our military and law enforcement the money that is necessary to make sure that we win this war.

That is what this debate is simply about. I am proud of what we are doing here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in 2000, Congress passed the CBI bill. In the most sensitive area of apparel and textiles, the bill endeavored to build on the strengths and complementarities of Caribbean countries. CBI nations were provided enhanced access to the U.S. market with some important requirements as to use of American fabric, and within these requirements the ability to dye and finish this material in their nation. Included was enhanced implementation of core labor standards.

In order to obtain a few votes to pass their fast-track bill, the administration cut a deal that turns its back on CBI. The attempt in this bill to carry out that deal is antithetical to the administration's rhetoric about the importance of expanded trade and about the needs of evolving economies. It is another troubling result of the decision of the administration and House Republicans to pass fast track on a partisan basis, refusing to address concerns of Democrats who have worked hard to craft constructive trade legislation these last years. The administration has missed an historic opportunity to build a viable, strong, bipartisan foundation for trade policy and the consequence is the attempt to ratify in this bill an act of expediency. It has zero to do with the war against terrorism.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Texas has now three times made a very impassioned speech regarding that this is for the troops, and I want to again say, every single person over here supports our troops. In addition to that, I will say I support our President 110 percent. In fact, I believe in our opposition to this rule that I am supporting the President more than you are.

Here is why. The President asked for \$27.1 billion. This bill is \$29.4 billion. You made reference to the Senate, in having a package to go to the Senate. The Senate is proposing to spend \$31 billion. That means we are going to compromise somewhere between 29.4 and 31. That is not what the President asked for.

This is more than just supporting our troops. We all support the troops. This is about fiscal responsibility and the debt limit.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, the House is in the business of taking votes to decide things. This week we took a vote on whether to congratulate the people of East Timor, as we should have. We took a vote on naming a Federal building, as we should have.

The majority has a plan to borrow \$750 billion and pass along the bill to our children. But they do not want to put that up for a vote. The choice that is before the House on this rule is very simple. Should we or should we not take a recorded vote on borrowing \$750 billion? Our only chance to cast a vote on that, if the majority has its way, is on this rule vote.

Defeat the rule, bring this question, like the question of congratulating the people of East Timor, before the American people so they can see where we as their elected representatives stand. Defeat this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, the Speaker of the House, for 2 minutes.

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of debate on this bill today. This bill has been on the docket for about 6 weeks trying to bring it together. In this bill is \$14 billion-plus for our men and women who fight the war in Afghanistan and around the world. In this bill is \$5 billion for New York so that they can recoup and rebuild their city for the losses they got on September 11. In this bill is \$7 billion for defense against terrorism in this country, air marshals, police, things to make this country safer so that we can travel, so that we can live our lives.

There is a lot of debate and a lot of demagoguery that goes on in a place like this. But there are times when you need to move forward, pass legislation, get it done and do the right thing. I have heard a lot of, again, conversation from the other side of the aisle. Do we need eventually to raise the debt ceiling in this country? You know we have to do that. There is not one person in the room who will deny that that has to be done. Do we do it in this bill? No. Do we give ourselves a possibility that we can do it at a later date? Yes. Do we have to make sure that there is some discipline in the budget as opposed to the other side of the Rotunda where there is no discipline? Yes. We need to do that. We need to do it for our own good. We also need to do it on mandatory and discretionary spending if we want to do the things in health care and prescription drugs that is right for this country.

You can vote no against this. If you vote no, you ought to know that you are voting against our military, you are voting against the people in New York. You need to know that you are

also voting against the ability for us to solve the problems that we have in this country. If you want to vote against trying to solve the problems in health care and prescription drugs, vote no for this bill.

If you want to move forward and have the Congress do the things that the American people expect us to do, then you want to vote yes for this rule and vote yes for the bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, because it robs the Department of Defense of \$13.2 billion that was requested by the President. I must say that I am surprised and frankly feel let down by my colleagues and good friends on the other side of the aisle, many of whom have in the past stood shoulder to shoulder with me in calling for more defense spending.

This rule includes a so-called "deeming" provision which says that the House shall consider the Budget Resolution to have passed a conference committee just as it passed the House. Doing so weakens national security because the budget resolution made two incredible raids on the Defense budget, reducing the money available to be appropriated for Defense by \$13.2 billion.

First, the Budget Resolution reduced the Budget Authority available for defense by \$10 billion by eliminating the contingency fund requested by the Department of Defense. I share some of the Budget Committee's concerns that this request was vague, but Congress is more than capable of working with the Department to determine how that funding can best be used, and no serious defense observer believes that the Department of Defense will not need this \$10 billion, and even more, for its operations in FY03. This rule today puts that funding off limits.

Second, the Budget Resolution reduced the Budget Authority available for Defense by \$3.2 billion which had been set aside by the Department of Defense for civilian health care accrual. The Budget Committee doesn't support doing this accrual accounting change, but taking the money away from the Department of Defense is the wrong answer. We have seen a consistent pattern in recent years of underestimating the costs in the Defense Health Program and many Operations and Maintenance accounts. The \$3.2 billion included for civilian accrual costs should be maintained as a hedge against cost escalations in these accounts.

In addition to being \$13.2 billion below the President's Request for defense, this resolution puts us as much as \$6.9 billion under the Defense Authorization bill the House approved just a few weeks ago. That bill maintained the \$3.2 billion originally requested for civilian accrual and it allocated \$3.7 billion of the contingency fund to high priority operational items.

We should reject this rule Mr. Speaker, and allow the Appropriations Committee to bring to the floor a Defense Appropriations bill that is at least equal to the President's request, a request which is already \$40 billion below what is required in procurement alone. That's not just according to me, that is the testimony given by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Richard Myers, before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee this year.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, is including \$10 million in this bill to assist in State efforts to prevent and control transmissible spongiform encephalopathy, including bovine spongiform encephalopathy, chronic wasting disease, and scrapie, in farmed and free-ranging animals, does that constitute a vital defense need?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Texas moved the previous question on the resolution.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 209, answered "present" 3, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]
YEAS—216

Aderholt
Akin
Arney
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggart
Billirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay

DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra

Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Ney

Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sullivan

Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—209

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Coyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon

Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecicka
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan

Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vislosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)

Waxman Wicker Wu
Weiner Woolsey Wynn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Bonilla Nethercutt Wamp

NOT VOTING—7

Burton Lipinski Wexler
Deutsch Mascara
Emerson Traficant

□ 1823

Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Messrs. SANDERS, LARSEN of Washington, BAIRD and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STEARNS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 94, noes 300, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—94

Ackerman	Hefley	Oberstar
Allen	Hill	Obey
Andrews	Hinchev	Olver
Baird	Hoekstra	Owens
Barrett	Holt	Pascrell
Becerra	Honda	Pelosi
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Berry	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Bishop	(TX)	Rodriguez
Borski	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez
Boyd	Jones (OH)	Sandlin
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Sherman
Brown (FL)	Kelly	Shows
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Slaughter
Clayton	Langevin	Snyder
Clement	Lee	Solis
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
DeFazio	Lowey	Stark
Delahunt	Lynch	Stupak
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Edwards	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Matsui	Tierney
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Farr	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Filner	McGovern	Velazquez
Ford	McNulty	Viscosky
Frank	Meehan	Waters
Gephardt	Meek (FL)	Watson (CA)
Gordon	Miller, George	Waxman
Harman	Mink	Wynn
Hastings (FL)	Neal	

NOES—300

Abercrombie	Barr	Blumenauer
Aderholt	Bartlett	Blunt
Akin	Barton	Boehler
Armey	Bass	Boehner
Baca	Bentsen	Bonilla
Bachus	Bereuter	Bono
Baker	Berkley	Boozman
Baldacci	Biggert	Boswell
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Barcia	Blagojevich	Brown (OH)

Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Portman	Graham	McIntyre	Sawyer
Bryant	Hunter	Price (NC)	Greenwood	Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky
Burr	Hyde	Pryce (OH)	Hall (OH)	Miller, Gary	Simpson
Buyer	Inslee	Putnam	Hilleary	Ortiz	Traficant
Callahan	Isakson	Quinn	Hinojosa	Platts	Watkins (OK)
Calvert	Israel	Rahall	Lampson	Radanovich	Wexler
Camp	Issa	Ramstad	Lipinski	Rivers	Woolsey
Cantor	Istook	Regula	Mascara	Sanders	
Capito	Jenkins	Rehberg			
Capps	John	Reyes			
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Reynolds			
Carson (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Riley			
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Roemer			
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Rogers (KY)			
Chambliss	Kanjorski	Rogers (MI)			
Collins	Keller	Rohrabacher			
Combest	Kennedy (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen			
Condit	Kennedy (RI)	Ross			
Cooksey	Kerns	Rothman			
Costello	Kildee	Roukema			
Cramer	Kind (WI)	Royce			
Crane	King (NY)	Rush			
Crenshaw	Kingston	Ryan (WI)			
Crowley	Kirk	Ryun (KS)			
Cubin	Kleczka	Sabo			
Culberson	Knollenberg	Saxton			
Cummings	Kolbe	Schaffer			
Cunningham	Kucinich	Schiff			
Davis (CA)	LaFalce	Schrock			
Davis (FL)	LaHood	Scott			
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Sensenbrenner			
Davis, Jo Ann	Larsen (WA)	Serrano			
Davis, Tom	Larson (CT)	Sessions			
Deal	Latham	Shadegg			
DeGette	LaTourette	Shaw			
DeLauro	Leach	Shays			
DeLay	Levin	Sherwood			
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus			
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Shuster			
Dicks	Linder	Simmons			
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Skeen			
Doyle	Lofgren	Skelton			
Dreier	Lucas (KY)	Smith (MI)			
Duncan	Lucas (OK)	Smith (NJ)			
Dunn	Luther	Smith (TX)			
Ehlers	Maloney (CT)	Smith (WA)			
Engel	Manzullo	Souder			
English	Matheson	Stearns			
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Stenholm			
Everett	McCollum	Strickland			
Ferguson	McCrery	Stump			
Flake	McHugh	Sullivan			
Forbes	McInnis	Sununu			
Fossella	McKeon	Sweeney			
Frelinghuysen	McKinney	Tancredo			
Frost	Menendez	Tanner			
Gallegly	Mica	Tauscher			
Ganske	Millender-	Tauzin			
Gekas	McDonald	Taylor (NC)			
Gibbons	Miller, Dan	Terry			
Gilchrest	Miller, Jeff	Thomas			
Gillmor	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)			
Gilman	Moore	Thornberry			
Gonzalez	Moran (KS)	Thune			
Goode	Moran (VA)	Thurman			
Goodlatte	Morella	Tiahrt			
Goss	Murtha	Tiberi			
Granger	Myrick	Toomey			
Graves	Nadler	Turner			
Green (TX)	Napolitano	Udall (CO)			
Green (WI)	Nethercutt	Upton			
Grucci	Ney	Vitter			
Gutierrez	Northup	Walden			
Gutknecht	Norwood	Walsh			
Hall (TX)	Nussle	Wamp			
Hansen	Osborne	Watt (NC)			
Hart	Otter	Watts (OK)			
Hastert	Oxley	Weiner			
Hastings (WA)	Pallone	Weldon (FL)			
Hayes	Pastor	Weldon (PA)			
Hayworth	Paul	Weller			
Herger	Payne	Whitfield			
Hilliard	Pence	Wicker			
Hobson	Peterson (MN)	Wilson (NM)			
Hoeffel	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (SC)			
Holden	Petri	Wolf			
Hooley	Phelps	Wu			
Horn	Pickering	Young (AK)			
Hostettler	Pitts	Young (FL)			
Houghton	Pombo				
Hoyer					

NOT VOTING—41

Baldwin	Coble	Dooley
Bonior	Conyers	Ehrlich
Burton	Cox	Emerson
Cannon	Coyne	Fattah
Carson (OK)	Deutsch	Fletcher
Clay	Dingell	Foley

□ 1844

Mr. SHOWS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4775, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATERIAL DURING CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 428

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to include extraneous material immediately following my remarks on the rule that has earlier passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

□ 1845

2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 428 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4775.

□ 1845

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.